

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
OXFORD DIVISION**

IN RE:

**CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND
NO. 2024-270**

NO. 3:25-MC-3-DMB-JMV

ORDER

On May 20, 2025, United States Magistrate Judge Jane M. Virden issued a report recommending that the “Petition of the United States for Summary Enforcement of Civil Investigative Demand” be dismissed. Doc. #5. The report warned that “[f]ailure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in this report will bar an aggrieved party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court.” *Id.* at 2–3. No objections to the report were filed.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), “[a] judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report ... to which objection is made.” “[P]lain error review applies ‘where a party did not object to a magistrate judge’s finding of fact, conclusions of law, or recommendation to the district court’ despite being ‘served with notice of the consequences of failing to object.’” *Quintero v. State of Tex. – Health and Hum. Servs. Comm’n*, No. 22-50916, 2023 WL 5236785, at *1 (5th Cir. Aug. 15, 2023) (citation omitted). “[W]here there is no objection, the Court need only determine whether the report and recommendation is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” *United States v. Alaniz*, 278 F. Supp. 3d 944, 948 (S.D. Tex. 2017).

Because the Court reviewed the report for plain error and concludes that the report, including its recommendation, is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law, the report [5]

is **ADOPTED** as the order of the Court. The petition [1] is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED, this 5th day of June, 2025.

/s/Debra M. Brown
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE